REMARKS

Claims 1 - 84 are pending in the Patent Application.

Claims 56 - 61, 63, 65, 67 - 68, 70, 72, 74 - 75, 77, and 79 - 83 are allowed.

Claims 1 - 55, 66, 73 and 84 are rejected.

Claims 62, 64, 69, 71, 76, and 78 are objected to.

Applicant appreciates Examiner's allowance of Claims 56 - 61, 63, 65, 67 - 68, 70, 72, 74 - 75, 77, and 79 - 83.

Claims 1-55 and 84 have been canceled by this amendment, rendering the rejections thereof moot.

The rejections of Claims 66, 73, and 84 on the basis of lack of antecedent basis for the respective phrases "the first intermediate signal" and "the second intermediate signal" (Claim 66); and "the third intermediate signal" and "the fourth intermediate signal" (Claim 73) have been corrected by appropriately substituting --a-- for "the" in the respective phrases. Consequently, Claims 66 and 73 are in condition for allowance. As indicated above, Claim 84 has been canceled by this Amendment, rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Claims 62, 64, 69, 71, 76, and 78 are objected to as being unclear because Examiner alleges that "NPN" and "PNP" are not specified and requests clarification.

Applicant has clarified the terms "NPN" and "PNP" in the above referenced claims by reciting the language "for N-type semiconductor material and for P-type semiconductor material" in said claims, which is intended to clarify the meaning of "NPN" and "PNP" within the established meaning of the semiconductor technology. To provide appropriate basis for the recitation of the claim language, the Specification has also been amended

simply to clarify the meaning of NPN and PNP in the last paragraph on page 5 of the Specification with the insertion of the language --in reference to N-type semiconductor material and P-type semiconductor material associated with NPN and PNP junction transistors--. Since this amendment to the Specification merely clarifies "NPN" and "PNP" no new matter has been added to the Specification.

Incidentally, Applicant contends that the terms "NPN" and "PNP" are so well recognized in the semiconductor art that an explanation of same may not be required in the Specification. To support Applicant's contention, enclosed with this Amendment is material from the textbook "Transistor Circuit Theory and Design" (dated 1963) which indicates that the terms have been well known in the semiconductor art for forty years. Nevertheless, for completeness, Applicant has amended the Specification and claims for clarification purposes, as requested by Examiner.

With the above amendments to the claims, including the cancellation of rejected Claims 1 -55 and 84, Applicant requests that Claims 62, 64, 66, 69, 71, 73, 76, and 78 be allowed with already allowed Claims 56 - 61, 63, 65, 67, 68, 70, 72, 74, 75, 77, and 79 - 83 and that the case pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 30,021

Leonard A. Alkov, Attorney for Applicant

Tel. No. 310.647.2577 Fax No. 310.647.2616

Raytheon Company P.O. Box 902 (E4/N119) El Segundo, CA 90245-0902